DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 034 HE 015 305

AUTHOR Fincher, Cameron
TITLE Academic Administration: Are There Differences That Matter?
INSTITUTION Georgia Univ., Athens. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Jun 82
NOTE 14p.; Originally presented as an invited lecture at the University of Virginia (Charlottesville, VA, November 18, 1980).
JOURNAL CIT IHE Newsletter; Jun 1982

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business Administration; Business Administration Education; *College Administration; College Role; Conflict Resolution; Decision Making; Higher Education; *Organizational Climate; Organizational Objectives; *Personnel Management; *Public Administration; Systems Approach; Teacher Employment

ABSTRACT

The differences between academic administration and business management and the distinctions between academic administration and public administration are addressed. Attention is directed to differences in purpose and internal organization; decisions and conflict resolution; environmental relations and internal affairs; and recruitment, selection, and development of personnel. Given a difference in purposes and a resulting difference in organizational structure of colleges and business/government, it follows that the processes adopted or developed for making decisions and resolving conflict differ. All of these differences ensure different kinds of relations with the public served by colleges and universities, and different norms, values, and incentives that govern many of their internal affairs. The different professional identities and allegiances of college faculties dictate different modes and styles of recruitment, selection, promotion, assignment, transfer, and monetary reward. Two reports that were influential in the reorganization of undergraduate and professional curricula in business management recommended that general concepts and principles of management were to be balanced with general or liberal education at the undergraduate level. In the early 1970s, the application of systems analysis to academic administration initially provided a general framework for the study and development of planning models but later was advocated for the efficiency it would enforce upon mis-managed colleges and universities. Attention is also directed to management by objectives and the differentiated functions of administration and governance at colleges. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED219034

Institute of Higher Education
University of Georgia

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION:

ARE THERE DIFFERENCES THAT MATTER?

by

Cameron Fincher

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Univ. of Georgia
Institute of HE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 015 305

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION: ARE THERE DIFFERENCES THAT MATTER?

By
Cameron Fincher

Institute of Higher Education
University of Georgia

Bertram Gross (1964) in his classic THE MANAGING OF ORGANIZATIONS discusses management and administration as synonymous. He apparently excludes the executive from his grouping of manager and administrator because there is no acceptable verb designating what the executive does. An understanding of administration evidently would specify how administrators administer. Management theory, in the same manner, would evidently explain how managers manage. But the executive is apparently left in his lofty position with neither a theory nor an activity of "execution."

If nouns are needed to signify the person-in-a-position and the organizational function in which he or she is engaged, verbs are helpful in describing more accurately what the person-as-administrator does in carrying out the responsibilities of an assigned organizational function. It is Gross's contention that the two basic elements of "managing" and "organization" can be expressed in a variety of terms. So much so, he provides the following list of words and phrases for combination as the user sees fit:

Managing	. . . an organization
Administering	. . . the activities of an organization
Governing	. . . organized human behavior
Guiding	. . . an enterprise
Coordinating	. . . an undertaking
Integrating	. . . a group of people
Running	. . . people
Directing	. . . the activities of people
Supervising	. . . subordinates
Controlling	. . . the use of resources (p. 239)

**This paper was originally presented as an invited lecture at the University of Virginia on November 18, 1980 and has been published previously by the Center for the Study of Higher Education there.*

It requires little effort to construct a similar list of words and phrases for use in the academic setting:

Administering	. . . a college
Managing	. . . a department
Coordinating	. . . a division
Directing	. . . a bureau, center, institute
Leading	. . . an office
Chairing	. . . a committee
	. . . a staff
	. . . faculty or faculty members
	. . . a program
	. . . a project
	. . . study group or task force
	. . . research team
	. . . a laboratory
	. . . a library

Thus, in an academic setting there are fewer terms to designate the activity but an abundance of comparable phrases denoting the object-of-the-activity. Even when a noun is used to designate a position such as comptroller, there is little expectation that the person in the position will take the word "controlling" with full meaning.

Disagreement is unlikely if we contend that the choice of participle is dependent upon the area designating the object-of-our-effort. Colleges, departments, centers, libraries, etc. tend to be budgetary units or functional divisions that may not be located in one place. Offices, programs, projects, etc. tend to be things with specific location and definite function. Committees, staffs, faculty groups, and task forces are groupings of people that may be quite impermanent with almost interchangeable membership. The phrases do not easily lend themselves to a logical separation as processes-things-people, but many of them can be so categorized.

The unsuitability of some combinations is

seen in the likelihood that any group of faculty members will resist being administered or managed -- and many will not care to be led. It is one thing to administer impersonal objects such as departments and another to administer the faculty. It will pique some faculty members for a dean to manage a program and it may infuriate them if the president manages the institution.

But most campuses have offices, projects, or service units that must be managed or administered. If faculty paychecks are not on schedule, someone is no doubt guilty of mismanagement, and dismissal will not be regarded as an inhumane remedy. Physical facilities must obviously be maintained and management is a matter of ensuring that they are. Equipment, supplies, and materials are also in obvious need of proper and suitable management, i.e. their purchase, storage, maintenance, and distribution.

The most important distinction on most college and university campuses, however, is between academic units and nonacademic units. Management may be an acceptable term for nonacademic units and the transfer of management concepts and techniques from the business corporation to these units may be in order. For traditional academic units such as colleges and departments, however, management may be resisted as an alien concept, and administration may be accepted by faculty members who otherwise regard "the administration" as their natural enemy.

Distinctions Worth Considering

The intent of this paper is to consider the differences between academic administration and business management that ought to matter to the faculty, staff, and students of American colleges and universities. If intelligence was once defined by the classical Greeks as the ability to see similarities in things that are different -- and difference in things that are similar -- there is a willingness to be half-intelligent about the management or administration of the nation's colleges and universities. There have been numerous charges over the past 15 years that our institutions of higher education are mis-managed -- and there has been strenuous advocacy that our colleges and universities adopt modern management skills and techniques that will ensure their efficiency in an era of limited resources. The federal government has supported in generous manner the development of planning, management, and evaluation tools for institutions that have bothered little about planning, management, and evaluation as specialized functions of education. To meet societal goals and preferences, the federal government has been called upon to fund social institutions that can serve that purpose. With federal funds has come a demand for accountability and managerial efficiency.

The question raised in this context is whether there are distinctions between academic administration and business management that colleges and universities should maintain and insist that others maintain. An additional question concerns the differences between academic administration and public administration. There are obvious differences between a university and a business corporation -- between a college and a government agency. But there are continuing questions about the differences in administration and management that should matter to those in an academic setting.

John Corson (1979) and John Millett (1976), among others, have raised the question without supplying a satisfying answer. Can the management of universities and colleges be improved by the adoption and use of managerial techniques developed for use in the nation's industrial and business corporations? Or, is there a basic difference between the management of universities and the management of business enterprises, government agencies, or non-profit organizations such as foundations? The ease with which individuals have moved from administrative posts in government to the executive offices of foundations to presidencies of major universities implies that at least some individuals can use the career rungs of public administration, business management, and educational leadership in a ladder of remarkable construction. Executives in the nation's largest corporations accept cabinet posts in the federal government with each change of "administrations." They sometimes escape the disappointments of that post by accepting appointment to a "comparable" position in a foundation or on a university campus. Only occasionally is there doubt that the skills and knowledge acquired in one organizational setting are transferable to the other. In each case, the appointment is seen by cynics as "political."

Yet Millett has reported that business executives, college administrators, and management scholars agree that the fields of corporate management and academic administration are so dissimilar as to preclude any useful exchange of management skills. Although it is often claimed that management science is transferable from one organizational setting to another, there is little credence to be placed in that adage that "management is management" -- i.e. an interchangeable array of techniques that serve all organizations equally well.

Organizations, for which management science is believed suitable, apparently differ in: (a) purposes, (b) modes of organization, (c) the processes by which decisions are made, (d) the means adopted by the organization to resolve internal conflict, (e) various relations with the environment in which the organization must work, and (f) the means by which it recruits, selects, and develops key personnel. Each of these differences would seem related to the administrative or managerial style favored by the organization and each is undoubtedly related to the choice of leadership in a time of crisis or re-organization.

Differences in Purpose

There is little doubt that colleges and universities differ in purpose from business corporations and government agencies. Although the purposes of institutions of higher education are said to be more ambiguous than those of the business corporation, there is a tendency to attribute to both the corporation and the government bureau a singularity of purpose they seldom possess. In a simplistic view, business and government have a "unit of measurement" that has an obvious appeal. The business organization has the dollar and the government agency has the vote. The university has the degree but nothing approaching the simplicity implied by efforts to make a profit and to get re-elected.

The purpose of an organization dictates many internal features, as well as its inputs and outputs. If the organization's purpose is to produce and distribute particular goods or services within a definable market, it will employ personnel for those purposes and not for others. Organizational theory has not been highly successful, however, in specifying how the choice of organizational purpose determines the structure and function of organizations. Purposes are neither fixed nor flexible in many organizations, but purpose is an important clue to organizational origins, an important determinant of what the organization becomes, and the key to how it serves its clientele or constituencies.

Differences in Internal Organization

The functions and activities of organizations are characterized by the specialization of work, the division of responsibility, and the inter-relations that must be established to permit cooperation and communication. The structure of a college or university may not be the function of design as much as it reflects historical accident and personalities. The separation of speech and drama from English literature on most college campuses is not a matter of logical analysis and rational design but a function of teaching interests and emphases at some time in the past. The location of a department of instruction may be a function of funding possibilities instead of curricular coherence. At the time the department could be established, funds were available in one location and not in another, suggesting that in the past it has been easier to establish separate departments across campus than to transfer within institutional budgets the funds by which they operated.

The organization of most colleges and universities is understood only by tracing the developmental history of the institution. The size, location, and specific functions of many departments of instruction were determined by decisions that at the time resolved some campus issue or permitted some acceptable degree of compromise among contending factions. The accidental features of university organization are seen in the location of courses, the use of pre-requisites, and departmental pecking-orders that no one designed.

Decisions and Conflict Resolution

Given a difference in purposes and a resulting difference in organizational structure, it follows that the processes adopted or developed for making decisions and resolving conflict may be quite different in the American college or university. The purposes of organizations are multiple, receive differential emphases, and are subject to change. The accomplishment of those purposes is often blocked by obstacle, changing circumstances, and internal disagreement as to both their specific nature and the means that must be adopted for their achievement. As administrators or managers within the various organizations of a pluralistic society seek to develop, maintain, and use their varying degrees of authority and responsibility, they engage in what Gross (1964) has called "the administrative struggle." Because they are significant participants in a complex, social institution, there are numerous questions about the distrubution of the power or influence, its origin through appointment or role-definition, and its uses in an organization that takes great pride in its collegial relations.

The gist might be that while the academic administrator in the college or university makes decisions, communicates information, plans, monitors, evaluates, and masters the administrative details of budgeting and fiscal accountability, personnel recruitment and selection, and the provision of

various services, he or she does so in a different manner -- if not with different intent and results. In much the same manner, as academic administration has become specialized and, to some degree, professionalized, it has not done so to the extent evident in the business corporation.

Decision making -- often regarded as the essence of management -- continues to have a collegial dimension that is qualitatively distinct from the interpersonal relations of a management team in industry or business. The university itself continues to be characterized by intricate -- if not intimate -- relationships between students and faculty -- scholars and their disciplines -- researchers and their research -- suggesting, to many observers, that the organization of a university is far more likely to be concentric than hierarchial.

There are both subtle and profound differences in the authority and responsibility delegated from governing boards to institutional leaders. There are traditions of academic freedom and institutional autonomy that do not easily permit comparisons with incorporation for business purposes. There remains some semblance of the "community of authority" once described by John Millett (1962) and a different kind of participatory, consultative, collaborative decision making about matters, both trivial and profound. It is difficult to imagine anything comparable to a faculty committee in the business corporation -- and it is even more difficult to imagine a business corporation dealing with an outside group comparable to alumni.

Environmental Relations and Internal Affairs

The differences between academic administration and business management in their respective treatments of environmental relations and internal affairs may be identified briefly. Both the university and the business corporation have become increasingly sensitive to public concerns and issues since the 1960s, and both have experienced considerable pressure from the outside to modify their internal arrangements in matters of personnel recruitment, selection, and advancement. The common enemies may be identified as the federal government and single-interest politics.

A commonality of threats, however, does not set aside pertinent differences that should be better understood. Despite the fact that many federal regulations now deal with the university and the corporation in their respective roles as employers, there remains great difference in the ease with which the two kinds of organizations can respond to public demand and societal pressure. The differences in purpose, mode of organization, decision making, and conflict resolution ensure different kinds of relations with the publics served by colleges and universities -- and different norms, values, and incentives that govern many of their internal affairs.

The different professional identities and allegiances of college faculties dictate different modes and styles of recruitment, selection, promotion, assignment, transfer, and monetary reward. Tenure would not seem to be a personnel decision found in the business corporation, but it may be a crucial decision for faculty members committed to traditional concepts of academic freedom and inured to other customs and practices of the academic life. The productivity or performance of faculty members is apparently related to their perceptions of a personal freedom to investigate, explore, criticize, or create. The processes of invention and discovery are not obvious, sequential events requiring coordination and direction as much as they require encouragement and moral support. It is difficult to identify a corporation in which the professional advancement of creative, productive employees is dependent upon the reactions and judgments of colleagues in other, competitive organizations.

Should We Manage or Administer?

The distinctions between management and administration vary even in industrial and business corporations. Managers are often regarded as middle management only, while administrators may be identified as executives. When used in this way, the first term implies that the manager has responsibility for a division, department, or unit and is competent to interpret and implement company plans and policies. In doing so, he is accountable for the success or failure of the unit. By contrast, the administrator or executive may be responsible for the larger company or corporation, its policies and plans. Comprehensive, long-range, or strategic planning is his proper function while operational or tactical planning is left to the manager.

Just as quickly, the two terms will be used in an obverse manner. The manager will be responsible for policy, planning, and overall institutional effectiveness. The administrator will be responsible for materials, equipment, and operations but not necessarily his fellow employees. In this usage, people are supervised or managed while materials, equipment, and operations are administered.

More recently, the coupling of the two terms

in administrative management is seen more frequently. This phrase apparently means that administration is a minor function of management and pertains primarily, if not entirely, to details that are involved in office activities. Readers may quickly gather that an administrative manager will be in charge of the supply room. They will not be able to infer, however, what a managerial administrator might do.

Whether management or administration is the generic term is not as important as recognition that management is a concept long ago appropriated by the business corporation. If the distinctions between a university and a business corporation are as important as their similarities, there is a need for a different concept or term to denote those differences. No one will argue seriously that universities should not be administered well. There are many who are skeptical, however, that universities can be managed well and others who are dubious that universities can be managed at all.

Meaningful distinctions between administration and management are to be made, it would seem, only by tracing their development and use as concepts within the nation's corporations, universities, and governmental agencies. It is not surprising that the terms have known cycles of popularity and preference, and one man's management -- today -- may be the other man's administration -- tomorrow.

Management by Technique

Although occasional bows are made in the direction of organizational differences, most management theorists have approached the problems and issues of management as if general concepts, skills, and techniques were applicable to most organizations, associations, and institutions. Herbert Simon's ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR may be cited as perhaps the single, most influential book published on the subject of management. It is significant therefore, that in issuing a third edition in 1976, Simon chose not to alter the original text of 11 chapters but merely added six chapters which were papers that he has published in the interim of two previous editions. He remains convinced that administration is a form of organizational behavior and that organizations are to be understood in terms of their decisional processes. As is well known, Simon presents a theory of decision-making which is relevant to administrative practices in business, government, and education.

The importance of organizational characteristics is underscored by Simon's contention that:

> A man does not live for months or years in a particular position in an organization exposed to some streams of communication, shielded from others, without the most profound effects upon what he knows, believes, attends to, hopes, wishes, emphasizes, fears, and proposes. (p. xvi)

Yet Simon's theory of administrative behavior is often seen as one that sets human values outside the boundaries of administrative decision in efforts to employ a criterion of efficiency. Simon's administrative man evidently would maximize if he could. Having "not the wits to maximize," he is content to satisfice -- a concept that is one of Simon's seminal contributions to decision theory.

Simon's views of administrative behavior were particularly influential in the concerted efforts of the 1950s to infuse new strength into the training and preparation of business management. The Pierson Report (1959), sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, identifies "management's responsibilities for formulating and carrying through decisions" as the most promising development in collegiate programs for business administration and devotes a key chapter of the report to decision-making as an organizing concept. The Gordon and Howell Report (1959), sponsored by the Ford Foundation and covering much the same ground, emphasized the analytical and informational tools that were increasingly available for a scientific or rational approach to managerial decision-making. Both reports were influential in the re-organization of undergraduate and professional curricula in business management.

More important, perhaps, both volumes were highly influential in putting across the need for administrative or managerial specialties that were generally applicable. General concepts and principles of management were to be well balanced with general or liberal education at the undergraduate level, and with specialized tools and techniques at the professional level. The organizational complexity of the business corporation required specialized skills and competencies in management, but the business leader remained a generalist in the sense that as a professional, he was expected to synthesize the diverse concepts of management science, human relations, and organizational theory. Little thought or discussion was given to training or preparation that would be organizationally-specific.

The rationale for business management that can be drawn from the literature of the past three

decades is one in which the primary concern is the employee. Management is not inaccurately defined as "the art of getting work done through others" and collegiate programs for business management were not foolish in building heavily on the behavioral and social sciences. The overall effort gave substance to the "managerial revolution" that was much in evidence -- even if wrongly heralded by James Burnham's (1941) book of that title. The middle management ranks of American industry and business expanded rapidly during the 1950s and 1960s. American occupations did indeed become "white collar," an event much displayed by C. Wright Mills (1953), but Burnham's "managerial society," in which the managers replaced the bourgeoisie as the dominant or ruling class, did not emerge as much as the "employee society" later described by Peter Drucker.

The human relations movement was a "quasi-ideological view" of the employee as a fellow human being with his priorities carefully arranged. Higher pay and better working conditions were important, but so was an opportunity to contribute, opportunity to advance in corporate ranks, and assurrances that his own personal worth and human dignity would be properly appreciated. As an employee, he was a striving, ambitious individual who was not indifferent to social approval and recognition.

Unfortunately, the individualistic beliefs of Social Darwinism and the Protestant Ethic gave way in the same years to a sense of togetherness and a desire-to-belong that produced William H. Whyte's (1956) ORGANIZATION MAN. Whyte was particularly devastating about the scientism that he saw as the first denominator of a new social ethic. Whyte was completely unsympathetic with applications of social and behavioral sciences that were so pretentious as to ensure "good group dynamics," improve communications, or worse still, measure personality.

More important for the development of managerial talents, the rationale stressed the need for continued training and preparation for the exercise of managerial decision. Having graduated from one of the prestigious schools of business management, the better students presumably could look forward to recruitment and selection as a management trainee by one of the 500 corporations identified by FORTUNE magazine. Jokes were made in passing that if lucky, the bright trainee might remain in training until his mid-fifties and enjoy a brief-but-highly-rewarding tenure as vice president before retirement. The implication was severe doubt about the ability of collegiate schools of business to prepare individuals for managerial responsibility. The recruiting and training practices of business corporations, however, fully signaled that colleges served a valuable screening service. Graduates of the better schools were obviously better bets on which to place corporate money.

The most significant feature of the emerging theories of management, however, may have been their shifting focus from the status, personal traits and characteristics, or <u>being</u> of the manager to his behavior, performance, or skill in applying techniques of interpersonal, inter-group, and organizational scope. In this scheme of things, both the manager and the group leader became behavioral roles that were in a state of <u>becoming.</u> Personality might still be a marketable item on occasion, but no serious theorist worried about personality or character as determinants of management or leadership.

Whatever managerial competence might be, it was acquired behavior. Industrial and business managers were to be developed by carefully arranged exposures to the challenge-and-response of the American enterprise system. Granted that management trainees were to be carefully screened, it then became necessary not to be swayed too greatly by the status variables on which the screening took place. The white Anglo-Saxon protestant male was obviously the best candidate for high managerial responsibility, but his success would depend on continued preparation and development under the tutelage of corporate executives. In the process the management trainee was expected to master an array of highly sophisticated management skills and techniques that were increasingly quantitative, computer-based, and organizationally-neutral. Whether called operations research, management science, systems engineering, or strategic planning, a host of concepts and techniques were to be mastered by the would-be corporate manager.

It mattered little that American industry and business were themselves ambivalent toward such techniques. It bothered no one that a leading authority (Steiner, 1979) could publish widely-read and respected books on corporate planning techniques and still conclude that "the manager is his own best analytical technique." In discussing the use of advanced quantitative methods of decision-making, the same authority can reflect the ambivalence of industrial and business leaders by writing contiguous sections on:

1. Don't underestimate the power of newer quantitative techniques.

2. Don't overestimate the power of newer

quantitative analytical tools.
(pp. 253-254)

It is not cynical to conclude that a stronger emphasis has been placed on quantitative, analytical techniques in the development of corporate managers as a means of control. There is no doubt about the impact of computer technology upon the conduct of American business, and there is little doubt about its impact on the behavior of corporate management. It is easy to suspect that the apparently inordinate concern of corporate management with sensitivity training, encounter groups, T-groups, and other forms of group process in human relations is a countervailing effort to stem the tide of rational, analytical, impersonal skills and techniques in management (See Back, 1973).

Educational Applications

The arrival of management science in academic administration has been much heralded but dubiously received. The early 1970s were days in which planned change models were greatly extolled and the management sciences were visited upon institutions of higher education in a manner similar to the plague. In its various guises as operations research, administrative sciences, general systems theory, systems engineering, or systems design, the application of systems analysis initially provided a general framework for the study and development of planning models but later was advocated for the efficiency it would enforce upon mis-managed institutions of higher education.

Among those advocating modern management techniques was the Committee for Economic Development (1973). The Committee was convinced that careful planning was essential to the survival of many colleges and universities and recommended the adoption of modern techniques for both long-range and short-range planning by all institutions of higher education. Such recommendations were in keeping with the Committee's earlier recommendation to the federal government that program budgeting be implemented in a concerted effort to achieve rational objectives. As a tool for sharpening management judgment in planning and decision-making, planning-programming-budgeting-systems provided a means of:

1. defining governmental programs in terms of specific results or desired outcomes,

2. identifying alternative methods of achieving those results,

3. comparing costs between the alternative methods.

4. developing measures for appraising effectiveness in achieving desired outcomes,

5. organizing data for continuous comparisons of results with costs,

6. facilitating the revision of plans and programs.

Management By Objectives (MBO), in particular, has met with various success in higher education because of its appearance as a management technique that puts the burden of performance on the heads of budgetary units. Heads of administrative units often believe that they are asked to specify unrealistic objectives for their division or department and then justify the following year's budget on their performance during the preceding year. Because of this it is difficult to separate evaluations of the department's performance from the evaluation of the individual administrator's competence. Clear distinctions are too infrequently made between what the program, department, or administrative unit does with its allocations and what the individual administrator does with his/her administrative duties. Where there is strong personal identity of an administrator with an administrative unit, there is even more reluctance to specify objectives by which administrative competence can be judged.

A conference held in 1975 to commemorate 20 years of "administrative theory" in education detected no unanimity among those engaged in educational administration. A keynote address by Jacob Getzels (1976) depicted how the perspectives of scientific management and human relations have been disrupted by the social issues of the 1960s and replaced by an emphasis on legal and economic entanglements. It was evident to Getzels that the behavioral and social sciences were no longer the dominant influence in administrative thought, having been displaced by "a spectacular rise of accountability" as the major thesis in administration. There was at the time great pressure on universities and administrators to turn away from "fundamental enigmas and to deliver technical services."

Elsewhere in the conference papers, Andrew Halpin (with Andrew Hayes) attributes the demise of the administrative theory movement to the possibility that the idea was oversold. The language

and mode of thinking of the behavioral scientist was "strange and confusing" to the educational administrator and a sufficient distinction was not made between the use of theory in administration and the search for THE theory. Unfortunately for the movement, it had not matured sufficiently by the 1960s to survive the external shocks of that period. Students of administrative behavior have concentrated on internal variables and could not handle "the politics of confrontation." A fourth reason defined by Halpin was the lack of depth in talent. Those who initiated the movement apparently could not resist the lures of high administrative position themselves, and those who were trained in the early days of the movement became professors of educational administration instead of practitioner/scholars.

Academic Versus Public Administration

Although academic administration is strongly influenced by public policy, the political climate in which it must function, and the innumerable government agencies with which it must deal, there are important -- and sometimes crucial -- distinctions to be made between administration in a college or university and administration in an elective or appointive office of government.

The similarities between the two are not unimpressive, and at one time, it was tempting to say that academic administration either was becoming, or should become, an explicitly avowed field of public administration. These were the days in which the nation's universities were increasingly referred to as national resources that should be regarded as public utilities. The appointment of university presidents was not completely apolitical, and if university presidents could be an interchangeable part with foundations, corporations, and government agencies, it was not absurd to view some of them as public officials whose actions and decisions were relevant to national thought and discussion. It is not impertinent to recall that Woodrow Wilson helped define public administration as a field worthy of serious study prior to becoming president at Princeton and then governor of New Jersey.

The similarities can be discussed a bit further before they begin to unravel. Public administration, too, would seem to be a field that is rapidly developing, a field that is searching for the right kind of ethos or paradigm, and a field whose time has apparently come. Like academic administration, the functions and activities of government have received intense criticism in the past 20 years. The accusation is frequently made that national and state governments can no longer "muddle through." If government is to become more responsive to its constituencies, it must become more efficient. To become more efficient, it should adopt procedures and techniques that will make public policy more rational. Indeed, many of the rational, analytical, quantitative, impersonal techniques that have been recommended for academic administration were recommended first for governmental agencies. Planning-programming-budgeting-systems (PPBS), despite the fact that program budgeting apparently originated in the federal government, can be traced in their journey from the Ford Company to the Department of Defense to the university campus. Management-By-Objectives (MBO) supposedly followed a route from Litton Industries to the Bureau of the Budget to the academic deanship. And zero-based-budgeting (ZBB) was much publicized in its itinerary from Texas Instruments to state capitols and the White House. In each case there was the explicit assumption that administrative problems in government and education could be resolved by the transfer of techniques found effective in the business corporation.

As Gross (1954) -- and others -- has pointed out, similarity is "a far cry" from identity, and there is a need to understand the differences in administration that are evident in the different types of organizations. There are similarities between public administration and business management that may be seen in the basic concepts and principles, their generalization at various levels of organizational complexity, and the values to which the language of administration gives expression. But the language of public administration is not identical with that of business management or academic administration, and the expressed values of the three must surely differ.

The development of administrative thought in public affairs has been influenced by many cross-currents with business management. Both fields may claim Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, Max Weber, Luther Gulick, and Lyndall Urwick as "pioneers" in their efforts to analyze and plan work, to deal with the push for efficiency, to introduce rationality into the organization of their work, and to deal with such issues as the delegation of authority and responsibility. Both fields have surely been influenced by the group of pioneers that Gross identified as launching "new beginnings" -- Mary Follett, Elton Mayo, Frita Roethlisberger, Chester Barnard, and Herbert Simon.

There are reasons to believe, however, that academic administration has developed in a stream

apart from the major currents of public administration and business management. Although public education at the elementary and secondary levels has been cognizant of the need for professionally prepared administrators, there are serious questions about the explicit recognition of such a need in higher education. Appointment to administrative responsibility on a college or university campus still appears as a decision in which the professional preparation of the individual did not weigh heavily. Faculty often expressed an antipathy to notions that academic administrators can or should be professionally prepared, and it is not uncommon to see a great emphasis placed on an administrative candidate's academic credentials that will give him or her credence with the faculty. Top institutional leadership in colleges and universities continues to be drawn from an incredible diversity of academic backgrounds. The presidents or chancellors of the nation's major universities display no specific pattern of preparation. Slight hints can be given of an academic career ladder leading from department head through a deanship to a vice presidency before assuming top administrative responsibility, but just as often that pattern will be violated by an appointment from without the institution or by an internal appointment that has many characteristics of "anointment." Neither the "out-and-out political appointee" nor the "protege-appointee" satisfies the lip service given consultation with the faculty and diplomatic relations with the public. The continuance of such practices, however, is one of the stronger forces behind affirmative action, the drive for participatory decision-making, and the demand of rational, analytical impersonal approaches.

Yet there are reasons to believe that the "political appointment" in higher education has a different quality from that in public affairs. It is seldom so blatant as some appointments in federal or state government, and it usually is "rationalized" in terms of the advantages that should accrue to the college or university. Nor does the protege-system work in exactly the same manner in academe. Proteges must establish a certain reputation as "brilliant and obviously rising" and if they earn a reputation for hatchet work, they usually do so with the full understanding that their tenure does not survive that of their benefactor.

There is a definite difference, then, in the "elective-and-appointive process" that prevails in educational institutions. Candidates for high offices are seldom elected by the casting of votes in an openly-run election. They are seldom appointed with the "advise-and-consent" features of some federal and state offices. An occasional governing board may reject an administrative appointment within the institution, but the event must be regarded as a rarity.

In discussing the differences between public administration and academic administration, it is well to mention that public administration is undergoing its own process of professionalization. Programs for the doctorate in public administration are increasingly evident, and various programs for the certification of "public managers" have been developed in an effort to formalize the training and preparation that public administrators receive. In each of these efforts there is insistence that public administration is neither administrative science nor political science. There is a willingness to draw heavily from organizational theory, management science, and the behavioral sciences, but public administration would view the public organization or government agency as both requiring and deserving a style or motif of administration that is its own.

Administration and Governance

If an intelligent theory of academic administration is to be developed for use and application in the 1980s, there must be explicit recognition of the duality that permeates the university as an educational institution. There must be a better understanding of administration and governance as differentiated functions of the institution that serve its purposes and reasons-for-being in a complementary manner. The understanding of these two functions must be conceptual and logical, as well as operational. And that understanding must be more widely appreciated by administrators, faculty, and students than it presently is.

The distinctions between administration and governance tell a great deal about the inappropriateness of management as a unifying or integrative concept in higher education. Preferences for the two concepts should not be semantical but should be based on a willingness to begin with working definitions. In the beginning, distinctions between the two terms may be heuristic -- in the sense of permitting us to begin. In the later stages of thought and discussion, however, the distinctions ought to be more compelling in their acceptance and use.

Administration should be an acceptable concept if it is understood to mean the interpretation and application of institutional policy. Administrative leadership is surely needed in the development or formulation of institutional policy, but

the need for administrative leadership does not negate the concept of administration as decisions and actions directly and immediately concerned with the execution of policy. The day-to-day operations of the institution require coordination and direction. Decisions must be made at the time and in the place where policy should specify that those decisions should be made. They must be made by individuals who are specifically charged with the administrative responsibility for doing so. If the decisions are faulty, the administrator is liable in either an ethical, moral, or legal sense. If the decisions are brilliant, the administrator is entitled to recognition.

Governance is a far more subtle concept and while its faults may quickly be evident, its brilliance is often difficult to detect. The location of governance and its occasion are difficult to specify. Boards of trustees are rightly charged with responsibility for certain aspects of governance, but boards of trustees cannot design and develop a curriculum. They teach no classes and they grade no final exams. The faculties of colleges and universities are responsible for certain governance functions in higher education. There is almost universal concession that faculties should be "free to learn and free to teach." Neither state nor society should dictate research or scholarly interests and what faculty teach students is a matter firmly believed to be best decided by faculty members.

Decisions of curriculum, course content, course requirements, and teaching method are decisions of academic governance. To make these decisions, the faculties of colleges and universities must have a governance structure to do so. More important, faculty need a clearly articulated process by which they reach decisions of curriculum and instruction. That process should be as open and explicit as any governance process can be. It should be devoid of all mystique and it should be free of the suppositions that so frequently dominate faculty committees and faculty representation in administrative and governance matters. The faculty is not a legislative branch of government, free to enact policy for administrative execution and equally free to remove administrators for failure to do so. Presidents and deans do not serve at the pleasure of the faculty in most institutions of higher education and could not possibly do so. Neither is the faculty organized labor whose sole governance responsibility is the negotiation of next year's contract. Neither a legislature/executive model nor a labor/management model is an intelligent interpretation of academic governance.

Academic governance begins both above in governing boards and below in faculty and student groups. It will be loosely defined however it is defined. It will not be a neatly ordered sequence with a beginning, a middle, and an end -- and it will often lack rational, analytic descriptions that closely fit other organizations and associations. It is academic governance that may deserve the label of "organized anarchy" (Cohen & March, 1974) but even there, the label is unfair. Academic governance should not be so easily dismissed but it does not always meet legal, economic, technical, and managerial concepts of rationality. Academic governance has a logic of its own that is not completely obscure. The achievements of American institutions of higher education suggest that academic governance is entitled to a logic of its own. Many critics and observers would hope, nonetheless, that the inner or unique logic of academic governance could be better explicated and that it would be more consistently applied. Public interest should insist that it is.

The essence of academic governance can be identified, without great distortion, as "deliberative process." One mark of a university must surely be its capacity for debate. If a university has the intellectual competence it should be noted for, and if its faculties have the knowledge, expertise, and intelligence for which they ostensibly have been appointed, there should be involvement in -- and commitment to -- a deliberative process by which knowledge can be derived and conveyed to others. A curriculum should not be a combination of courses decided upon in 1912, 1946, or 1968; it should be one of the outcomes of continuing deliberation among faculty, students, and other institutional participants who can contribute significantly to the process. Other outcomes of that process should be meaningful course requirements, dedicated teaching, systematic and fair evaluations of student learning, and a critical appraisal of programs of study. The process should include a concern for academic standards that are relevant in a pluralistic society, professional standards that are meaningful in institutions that are surely diverse, and policies that enable constructive change in programs and services to students and other clienteles of the institution.

The difficulties of getting faculty to distinguish between administration and governance are compounded at the level of governing or coordinating boards. Frequently lacking is an adequate concept of policy per se and an appreciation of the governance processes taking place within the institutions themselves. Procedures for program approval and review often suggest that colleges and

universities are incapable of self-determination or autonomy and must be protected from themselves. In recent years on many occasions, such an assumption by political leaders and public officials has been correct. Those who grasp so eagerly the notion of accountability are equally quick to view the local college or the state university as organized anarchy.

A crucial need in American higher education must surely be a re-examination of the governance responsibilities of faculties at the institutional level and of governing or coordinating boards at the state level. Both groups should articulate with finer precision their conceptualization of policy -- and should re-establish their rightful claims to policy as an organizing, implementing principle. It is not unfair to say that academic administration is far more mature in 1980 than academic governance is. Many institutions of higher education may be better administered than they deserve to be -- given the uncertain status and function of governance structures and the apparently widespread confusions about governance process. Too many faculty committees meet and haggle on the basis of their suppositions concerning their specific charges and their particular responsibilities. Too many governing boards are caught up in administrivia, fretting about state purchasing requirements, the acceptance of gifts that will be used for tax write-offs, travel regulations, and student complaints when the dean of students is not the right sex, race, age, or ethnic group.

The interlacing of administration and governance is the major challenge facing institutional leadership. Survival for many institutions in the 1980s may well depend upon the success of their leaders in finding outside funds. It is more likely, however, that survival will depend upon the institution's success in developing academic programs and services that meet the needs and expectations of a changing student population. Faculty who do not accept their governance responsibilities with full appreciation of the need to improve instruction, revise traditional programs, develop new programs and services, and re-affirm relevant academic standards will contribute directly to their continuing loss of professional status. Governing boards that do not re-define their responsibilities for institutional policy and leadership will contribute to the decay of institutions they have been appointed to preserve and enhance.

In an ideal world where institutions of higher education re-establish their intellectual and cultural leadership, it is not impossible to envision internal governance structures that are rightly concerned with academic programs and services and external governing boards that develop policy and encourage institutional leadership. It would then be permissable to imagine academic administration that is professional in the finest sense of that word and fully capable of administrative leadership. We could then infer that the dominant interest and concern of American colleges and universities were not survival but education.

REFERENCES

Arnold, Thurman W. The Folklore of Capitalism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

Back, Kurt W. Beyond Words: The Story of Sensitivity Training and the Encounter Movement. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1973.

Bereleson, Bernard and Steiner, Gary A. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1964.

Burnham, James. The Managerial Revolution: What is Happening in the World. New York: John Day, 1941.

Churchman, C. West. The Systems Approach. New York: Dell Publishing, 1968.

Cohen, Michael D. and March, James G. Leadership and Ambiguity. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Committee for Economic Development. Budgeting for National Objectives: Executive and Congressional Roles in Program Planning and Performance. New York: CED, 1966.

Committee for Economic Development. Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School. New York: CED, 1968.

Committee for Economic Development. The Management and Financing of Colleges. New York: CED, 1973.

Corson, John J. "Management of the College or University: It's Different." Topical Paper No. 16. Tucson: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, 1979.

Getzels, Jacob W. "Educational Administration Twenty Years Later: 1954-1974" In Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Raphael O. Nystrand (Eds.) Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977.

Gordon, Robert A. and Howell, James E. Higher Education for Business. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Gross, Bertram M. The Managing of Organizations: The Administrative Struggle. Volumes I and II. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Halpin, Andrew W. and Hayes, Andrew E. "The Broken Ikon, Or, What Ever Happened to Theory?" in Cunningham, Hack, and Nystrand (Eds.) Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1977.

Henry, Nicholas. Public Administration and Public Affairs. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Maccoby, Michael. The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.

Mason, Henry L. College and University Governance: A Handbook of Principle and Practice. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1972.

Millett, John D. "Higher Education Management Versus Business Management." Educational Record, 1976, 56, 221-225.

Millett, John D. Management, Governance and Leadership: A Guide for College and University Administrators. New York: AMACOM, 1980.

Mills, C. Wright. White Collar: The American Middle Classes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Pierson, Frank C. and Others. The Education of American Businessmen: A Study of University-College Programs in Business Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Ross, Ralph & Van Den Haag, Ernest. The Fabric of Society: An Introduction to the Social Sciences. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1957.

Selznick, Philip. Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making in Administrative Organization. Third Edition. New York: Free Press, 1976.

Steiner, George A. Strategic Planning: What Every Manager Must Know. New York: Free Press, 1979.

Whyte, William H., Jr. The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

IHE NEWSLETTER
June, 1982
Athens, Georgia 30602

UPD 7482 6-82